



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Εὐριπίδου Ἑλένη. Ad novam codicum Laurentianorum factam a G. Vitellio collationem recognovit et adnotavit HENRICUS VAN HERWERDEN. Lugduni-Batavorum, 1895.

Euripides. *Helena*. Edited with Introduction, Notes and Critical Appendix by C. S. JERRAM, M. A. 2d edition. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1892.

The appearance of a new edition of the *Helena* by van Herwerden, the indefatigable and now veteran scholar on whom the mantle of Cobet has not unworthily fallen, should be an event of no little interest in the philological world. van Herwerden is admitted to be by far the best exponent of the great master's views and tradition; and those views are in the strongest antithesis to much which the most eminent German scholars of the present time are agreed to accept. I mean, of course, as to the limits of conjectural emendation. van Herwerden shares with our own countryman, Blaydes, the belief that long acquaintance with the style of an author, combined with continual and unintermitted study of the niceties of the language he writes in, are sufficient, in time, and in the hands of a recognized expert, to justify the assertion that much which forms part of the MS tradition is wrong, and has descended to us from a corrupted original. It is well known that the counter-view is at this time held and asserted with extraordinary positiveness by some leading exponents of classical philology in Germany. The *Culex* of Prof. Leo is perhaps the most marked illustration of this resolute adherence to MSS in despite of sense and probability: it is not too much to say that if some of the interpretations to be found in it are possible, nothing is impossible.

The new edition starts with a great advantage. Prof. Vitelli of Florence has re-collated the XIVth-cent. Laurentian codex (plut. XXXII 2) on which alone the text of the *Helena* rests as an independent source and which he calls L. He has, however, examined, besides, two other MSS, one in the Laurentian library, which he calls G, the other in the Vatican, which he calls P. Neither G nor P is of any great value except for correcting L; both Vitelli believes to be copies of a copy of L. It appears from this that the hopes which in 1872 were roused by a communication of Prinz sent to *Fleck-eisen's Jahrbücher*, CV, pp. 525-8, to the effect that G was a new source for the text of *Helena* of little less importance than L, are not justified by more minute examination. It is, however, in the judgment of Wilamowitz, who collated it some years before Vitelli, of considerable utility, as having been written before the interpolated readings which are found in L from the second or third hand had been introduced into that MS. van Herwerden has thought G of sufficient importance to be cited regularly through the play; and this, combined with the careful manner in which the first hand of L has been distinguished by Vitelli from the second and third, forms one of the chief claims which the new edition presents to supersede all previous ones.

Mr. Jerram's reprint of his former edition, published in 1882, is a scholarly piece of work, which ought to recommend itself to masters and teachers in the universities. It has been read and is sometimes quoted by van Herwerden; I hope that it may take less than ten years to reach a third issue, which it richly deserves, and to which the new labours of the Dutch philologist will make an important accession of new and original materials.

A noticeable feature in v. Herwerden's edition is the substitution of η for ϵ in the 2d pers. sing. indic. of the middle and passive verb; of $\tau\alpha\theta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\iota\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, etc., for $\tau\iota\theta\eta\varsigma$ $\iota\eta\varsigma$, as laid down by Cobet; of $\sigma\acute{\omega}\zeta\omega$ $\theta\nu\eta\sigma\kappa\omega$ for $\sigma\acute{\omega}\zeta\omega$ $\theta\nu\eta\sigma\kappa\omega$; of $\delta\mu\omicron\iota\omicron\varsigma$ $\epsilon\tau\omicron\iota\mu\omicron\varsigma$, as in Thucydides and Herodotus, not $\delta\mu\omicron\iota\omicron\varsigma$ $\epsilon\tau\omicron\iota\mu\omicron\varsigma$, as is generally assumed for the Tragic and Comic writers: lastly, of combinations like η $\epsilon\nu$, etc., for η ν .

Of the scholars who have in quite recent times written on the Helena, F. G. Schmidt, Wecklein, Schenkl are mentioned with most approbation, and their conjectures cited most frequently. But the critical notes are studded with names, inasmuch that the editor's own modest 'v. H.' is comparatively obscured, whilst Musgrave, Elmsley, Badham, Paley (to mention only English scholars) recur again and again. This, I think, should recommend the book to Englishmen. How often have our countrymen found reason to complain of being neglected or even ignored in foreign editions! Here at least no such complaint is possible. This is only fair: a glance at Blaydes' Aristophanes or Jebb's Sophocles is enough to show that we do not ask more than we give.

The following remarks are the result of a careful perusal of v. H.'s edition, and, though slight, are based on a very long familiarity with the play. Mr. Jerram has already incorporated some suggestions of mine in his new issue of 1892.

85. $\acute{\alpha}\tau\alpha\rho$ $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$; $\pi\acute{o}\theta\epsilon\nu$ $\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ $\epsilon\acute{\xi}\alpha\nu\delta\acute{\alpha}\nu$ $\sigma\epsilon$ $\chi\rho\acute{\eta}$;

So LG. Pflugk suggested $\pi\acute{o}\theta\epsilon\nu$; $\tau\acute{\iota}\nu'$ $\epsilon\acute{\xi}\alpha\nu\delta\acute{\alpha}\nu$ $\sigma\epsilon$ $\chi\rho\acute{\eta}$; This is rhythmically faulty: perhaps $\pi\acute{o}\theta\epsilon\nu$ $\tau\acute{\iota}\nu'$, *unde quem*, 'whence and whom?' a double question, in which $\tau\acute{\iota}\nu'$ follows $\pi\acute{o}\theta\epsilon\nu$ so closely as hardly to be separable (metrically) from it. Cf. 871 $\acute{\alpha}\tau\alpha\rho$ $\tau\acute{\iota}$ $\tau\acute{\alpha}\mu\grave{\alpha}$ $\pi\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\iota$ $\theta\epsilon\sigma\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$; v. H. gives $\acute{\alpha}\tau\alpha\rho$ $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ $\pi\acute{o}\theta\epsilon\nu$; $\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ μ' $\alpha\nu\delta\acute{\alpha}\nu$ $\sigma\epsilon$ $\chi\rho\acute{\eta}$;

III. v. Herw. accepts and prints $\kappa\alpha\rho\pi\acute{\iota}\mu\omicron\nu\varsigma$ $\epsilon\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$ $\kappa\acute{\iota}\nu\kappa\lambda\omicron\nu\varsigma$, Nauck's conj. for $\kappa\alpha\rho\pi\acute{\iota}\mu\omicron\nu\varsigma$. Jerram defends $\kappa\alpha\rho\pi\acute{\iota}\mu\omicron\nu\varsigma$ as accentuating the contrast between the succession of fruitful seasons and the fate of the storm-tost warrior on the barren sea. This appears to me fanciful. Without any such idea, Catullus, merely as a description of time that goes on year after year bringing its regular succession of harvest and winter, says, XCV 1, 2 *Myrna mei Cinnae nonam post denique messem Quam coepta est nonamque edita post hiemem*. So far as the word can be thought to have any *special* force, it would seem to lie in the idea of *successive* years, implying a considerable period of time.

117. $\acute{\omega}\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho$ $\sigma\acute{\epsilon}$ γ' , $\omicron\nu\delta\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\eta\sigma\sigma\omicron\nu$, $\acute{\omicron}\phi\theta\alpha\lambda\mu\omicron\iota\varsigma$ $\acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{\omega}$.

Hermann $\acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu$, and so Dindorf, Nauck and Badham. v. H. keeps $\acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{\omega}$, translating 'Ita ($\gamma\epsilon$, sc. *vidi eam*) ut te oculis video meis.' Here, as in many other cases throughout the play, the Dutch editor performs a signal service in recalling the MS reading. I will mention some others. 182 $\theta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omicron\nu\sigma\omicron'$ $\acute{\alpha}\mu\phi\acute{\iota}$ for

ἀμφιβάλλοντος ἐν τε of Seidler; ἐπὶ τὸ δύστυχέστατον | κάλλος, ὡς ἔλοι γάμον ἐμόν for Hermann's improbable ἐπὶ τὸ δύστυχές τε κάλλος | ὡς γάμον ἐμόν; 488 σφίζεται, the m. pr. of L and also the reading of G, for σφίζομαι (Badham); 515 σοφῶν δ' ἔπος for δέ του of Dobree and Cobet; 520 μελαμφαῖς for Cobet's μελαμβαθῆς, cf. κελαινοφαῖς ὄρνα Ran. 1331, μελαμφαῖς μυχοῦς Carcin. fr. 5, 3 Nauck²; 620 πατέρ' ἐς οὐρανὸν for πάλιν (Clark, Nauck) or πνεῦμ' (Vitelli); and see especially on 1301-70.

121. αὐτὸς γὰρ ὅσοις εἰδόμην καὶ νοῦς ὄρᾱ.

I suggest αὐτὸς γὰρ ὅσοις εἶδον ἦν καὶ νῦν σ' ὄρῳ 'I saw with my own eyes the same woman I now see you before me.'

124, 5. Hel. αἰαὶ κακὸν τόδ' εἶπας οἷς κακὸν λέγεις.

Teuc. ὡς κείνος ἀφανῆς ξὺν δάμαρτι κλήζεται.

'Your stay is a misfortune for those whom it affects.' 'Yes, for Menelaus is reported to be lost at sea with his wife.' οἷς κακὸν λέγεις is a *tentative* remark: she wishes to learn more. From this point of view she is taken up by Teucer, who tells her in more detail of what has happened.

148, 9. ὄνομα νησιωτικὸν

Σαλαμῖνα θέμενον τῆς ἐκεῖ χάριν πάτρας.

v. H. remarks: 'ἐκεῖ vix sanum. Exspectes cum Schmidtio ἐμῆς.' I cannot feel the force of this.

175-7. ἀχάριτας ἴν' ἐπὶ δάκρυσι

παρ' ἐμέθεν ὑπὸ μέλαθρα νύχια παιάνας

νέκυσι μελομένους λάβῃ.

LG give νέκυσιν ὀλομένους. Badham prints νέκυσι μελομένας, which Wecklein and v. H. correct to ν. μελομένους. The conj. is not necessary, and though in Phoen. 1302, 3 Euripides has ἰαχὰν στενακτὰν | μελομέναν νεκροῖς, the combination νέκυσιν ὀλομένοις is supported by Phoen. 1295 νέκυν ὀλόμενον and φθιμένων νεκῶν Supp. 45, 6. Moreover, the change from νέκυσιν ὀλομένοις to νέκυσι μελομένους is rather violent, involving a *double* depravation of letters. The occurrence, too, of the active πυρὶ μέλουνσαν δαίῳ in 195, 6 is rather against μελομένους in 177.

294, 5. ἀλλ' ὅταν πόσις πικρὸς

ξυνῇ γυναικί, καὶ τὸ σῶμ' ἐστὶν πικρόν.

σῶμ', which T. B. Macaulay emended into βρῶμ', and of which v. H. mentions besides seven corrections, is retained by Jerram, who accepts W. G. Clark's interpretation, 'even her *life* is hateful to her.' This puts some violence on the passage. May not the meaning be '*his* very person is offensive,' i. e. the person of the barbaric husband? *both* are πικρά, the relation of husband and the *person* of the husband.

308, 9. Cho. πόλλ' ἂν γένοιτο καὶ διὰ ψευδῶν ἔπη.

Hel. καὶ τὰμπαλὶν γε τῶνδ' ἀληθείας σαφῇ.

All this seems to me right, and especially ἀληθείας, sc. ἔπη. 'Many a word

may be uttered falsely.' 'Yes, and the reverse, many words may be words of truth and indubitable.'

344, 5. κατὰ χθονὸς
τὰν χθόνιον ἔχει τῆχαν.

χρόνιον v. H., certainly the best conj. yet offered.

380-3. ἀ μορφῇ θηρῶν λαχνογνίων
δμματι λάβρω σχῆμα †λεαίνης
ἐξαλλάξας †ἀχεα λύπης.

To the existing conjectures I add the following: ἀ—μαίνεις—αἰσχεα. It seems impossible that Eurip. should have represented Callisto as turned into a *lioness*. Hyginus, who mentions, P. A. II 1, various forms of the Callisto legend, makes no allusion to any transformation except that of a *bear*. σχῆμα would seem to require some genitive; μορφᾶς, which has been suggested, is perhaps too remote from σχῆμα, though otherwise giving a fair sense: 'quae figurae speciem polluis violento lumine horrentis ursae,' or possibly δμματα λαβρῶ is a corruption of σώματος ἄβροῦ. By αἰσχεα I mean 'ugliness': in becoming a she-bear, Callisto became an unsightly object, but lost her grief.

400. τοὺς δ' ἐκ θαλάσσης ἀσμένους πεφευγότας.

Cobet's conj., ἀσμένους, is now found to be in LG, not ἀσμένως.

443, 4. ὦ γραῖα ταῦτ' αὐτ' ἐπη κἀλλως λέγειν
ἐξεστι· πείσομαι γάρ· ἀλλ' ἄνεις λόγον.

So v. H. most excellently for ταῦτα αὐτ' ἐ. καλῶς λέγεις. The old woman had requested Menelaus in no very courteous terms to go away. He replies: 'You might have said the same thing civilly; be a little less rude.' The same critic rightly rejects W. G. Clark's χόλον, Badham's μόχλον, for λόγον.

508, 9. ἦν μὲν ὠμόφρων τις ἦ
κρύψων ἐμαντὸν εἴμι πρὸς ναυάγια.

v. H. here accepts Badham's emendation of the MS reading κρύψας (LG). The poet perhaps speaks loosely, and without grammatical strictness. 'I will hide myself and go to the place of the wreck.' It seems very improbable that κρύψων should have become κρύψας: I should prefer to explain κρύψας of *assuming a disguise* than so far violate my palaeographical sense. Does v. H. make sufficient allowance for this important factor in critical questions of text? I see Jerram retains κρύψας, but without explanation. But in 496 Nauck's διπλοῦν for ἀπλοῦν seems almost demanded by the series of interrogative clauses, which is interrupted if ἀπλοῦν of LG is retained.

532, 3. φησὶ δ' ἐν φάει
πόσιν τὸν ἄμὸν ζῶντα φέγγος εἰσορᾶν.

This 'mira abundantia,' as v. Herwerden calls it, seems to mark the Helena, at least as presented by LG. 386, 7 ὤλεσεν, ὤλεσε πέργαμα Δαρδανίας | ὀλομένους τ' Ἀχαιοὺς, where v. H. gives ὀρομένους. 774, 5 ἐνιαυσίων—ἐτεσι—ἐτῶν, where

v. H. conj. *κύκλων*. 1310, 11 *ζυγίους ζεύξασα θεὰ σατίνας*. And may not this be the explanation of the difficult *τείχεα δὲ φλογερὸς ὥστε Διὸς ἐπέσυντο φλόξ*? If we write *φλογερὰ σ'(α)* for *φλογερὸς* the *absurdity* of the iterated *φλόξ* is avoided, or at any rate lessened. 'Over thy flame-wrapt walls, as it were, a flame of Zeus swept.'

578, 9. Hel. οὐ γάρ με λεύσσωσιν σὴν δάμαρθ' ὁρᾶν δοκεῖς;
Men. τὸ σῶμ' ὁμοῖον, τὸ δὲ σαφές μ' ἀποστερεῖ.

This might be retained by making *σῶμ'* nominative to *ἀποστερεῖ*: 'your figure is like, but it will not allow me to be certain,' literally 'keeps from me any positive certainty.' *ἀποστερεῖν* is followed by a double accusative elsewhere. v. H. prints *τὸ δὲ σαφές γ' ἀπεστ' ἔτι* of Schmidt.

661. *πικρὰς ἐς ἀρχὰς βαίνεις*.

This is taken from the margin of L, where it is mentioned as a v. l. for *πικρὰν ἐς ἀρχάν*, the reading of G, and of L itself. v. H. restores it as more poetical, and considers the singular to have ousted it in consequence of the sequent *πικρὰν φάτιν* in 662. The change seems very Greek, and ought, I think, to recommend itself to future editors: hitherto *πικρὰν ἐς ἀρχάν* has been unquestioned.

700. *Μενέλαε, κάμοι πρόσδοτέ τι τῆς ἡδονῆς*.

πρόσδοτέα Elmsley, and so Badham. I should have thought this conjecture certain, were it not that Hermann, Cobet, Nauck, Paley have offered others, and that v. H. says 'optio difficilis.'

738, 9. *τούς τ' ἑμοὺς караδοκεῖν*
ἀγῶνας, οἱ μένουσιν, οὓς ἐλπίζομεν.

Musgrave altered this to *μένουσί μ' ὤς*. Though *μένουσιν* is perhaps a little unusual, it is made less so by *οὓς ἐλπίζομεν*, and the double relative is too marked a feature to be lightly sacrificed. Even if *μένουσί μ'* is admitted, *οὓς* should, I think, be retained. Similarly in 737 *οἱ τ' ἐσμέν τύχης* is sufficiently idiomatic to be kept (see Paley and Jerram), and surely cannot have got into the text from depravation.

764. *ἡ πόλλ' ἀνῆρου μ' ἐνὶ λόγῳ μιᾷ θ' ὁδῷ*.

LG *ἐν ὀλίγῳ*. The correction is Pierson's, and is perhaps the finest made by any critic in this play. Superior perhaps in acuteness and equally certain is Bothe's *τὸν Νηλέως τ' ἀπαῖδα* for *τὸν Θησέως τε παῖδα* of LG (847).

771. *κάλλιον εἶπας ἥ σ' ἀνηρόμην ἐγώ*.

This is the remark of Helen to Menelaus, who has described to her in outline his chief wanderings. A longer narrative he begs to be spared; it would only be to recall sorrow. Helen, quite satisfied with what he has told her, replies: 'Your courtesy in what you tell me transcends my wish in asking you the question.' *κάλλιον*, I think, is genuine, and refers to Menelaus' kindness and good feeling in gratifying her curiosity to the extent he has done.

803. μή νυν καταιδού· φεύγε δ' ἐκ τῆσδε χθονός.

'Think it no shame to fly,' Jerram, hardly giving the full strength of the word. She means that Menelaus must not let shame prevail to the extent of allowing himself to be killed. Heracl. 1027 ἐπεὶ μ' ἀφῆκε καὶ καταδρόσθη κτανεῖν allowed shame to prevail against killing Eurystheus. Hipp. 772 Phaedra will hang herself δαίμονα στυγνὰν καταιδεσθεῖσα, overpowered by her shame for the unhappiness of her rejection by Hippolytus.

864. LG give thus:

θεῖον δὲ σεμνὸν θεσμὸν αἰθέρος μυχῶν.

For σεμνὸν θεσμὸν I offer σεμνόθεσμον and (perhaps) τε for δέ. The genitives depend on θεῖον, 'brimstone for the deeps of air,' i. e. which properly belongs to it as a purifier.

903. εἰτέος δ' ὁ πλοῦτος ἄδικος τις ὦν.

Possibly εἰ τις. 'Cum si quid aliud iniustae sint divitiae,' Wealth is treated as the highest development of injustice.

920, 1. αἰσχρὸν τὰ μὲν σε θεία πάντ' ἐξειδέναι
τά τ' ὄντα καὶ μέλλοντα, τὰ δὲ δίκαια μῆ.

v. Herwerden in early life made this conj. for τὰ τ' ὄντα καὶ μῆ, τὰ δὲ δίκαια μῆ εἰδέναι. It has also been made independently by the Cambridge scholar W. G. Clark. The coincidence should go far to recommend it; and the MS reading is extraordinarily tame. Yet see on 532, 3.

1036, 7. εἰσφέρεις γὰρ ἐλπίδας
ὥς δὴ τι δράσων χρηστὸν εἰς κοινόν γε νῶν.

γε is insufferably weak. I suggest τε.

1049-51. Hel. βούλη λέγεσθαι μὴ θανῶν λόγῳ θανεῖν;
Men. κακὸς μὲν ὄρνις, εἰ δὲ κερδανῶ λέγειν,
ἐτοῖμός εἰμι μὴ θανῶν λόγῳ θανεῖν.

To avoid the repetition of λόγῳ θανεῖν, Cobet proposed to write τεθνηκέναι in 1049. Dindorf, Nauck, Schenkl, and now v. Herwerden have approved this alteration. I am not convinced that it is right. The triple rhyme θανεῖν—λέγειν—θανεῖν is possibly intentional; and iteration of the same word or combination of words seems particular to the play. But, to take a higher ground, is it not better *poetically*? Menelaus clinches his acceptance by using the very same words as Helen. As for κερδανῶ λέγειν, I think it may be an anticipation by Menelaus of the plan mentioned 1076-7, according to which he himself tells the story of his own supposed shipwreck, as the one seaman saved. 'If I gain (win besides) the right to speak, i. e. if the condition of my being reported dead by shipwreck is to tell the story myself (as the one supposed survivor), I am ready to be so reported; because I shall be not dead, but alive all the time.'

1078, 9.

καὶ μὴν τὰδ' ἀμφίβληστρα σώματος ῥάκη
 ξυμμαρτυρήσει ναυτικῶν ἐρειπίων.

The genitive *v. ἐρειπίων* is not after *ξυμμαρτυρήσει* (Jerram, seemingly), but in close connexion with *ῥάκη*, hardly in the sense which Hermann assigned: 'will confirm my assertion that they are rags from the wreck,' but = *ῥάκη δντα ναυτικῶν ἐρ.* 'will join to bear witness, as rags that belong to (or form part of) a wreckage.'

1133-5.

τέρας οὐ τέρας, ἀλλ' ἔριν
 Δαναῶν νεφέλαν ἐπὶ ναυσὶν ἄγων
 εἰδῶλον ἱερὸν Ἥρας.

So L, with -ας over *νεφέλαν*. Badham wrote on this: 'Utinam omnia in his literis aequae certa essent atque Euripidem in hoc loco *Γέρας οὐ Γέρας ἀλλ' ἔριν Δ. νεφέλαν* scripsisse.' He is accepted by v. H. and also, which is more surprising from so sceptical a critic, by Kirchhoff. Yet *τέρας* is used of Helena twice before: 254 ἄρ' ἡ τεκοῦσα μ' ἔτεκεν ἀνθρώποις *τέρας*; in allusion to the marvellous story of her birth from an egg, and 258 *τέρας γὰρ ὁ βίος καὶ τὰ πράγματ' ἐστί μοι*. The meaning might be 'a prodigy that was not so much a prodigy, as a cause of contention,' like Androm. 103 Ἴλιφ αἰπείνῃ Πάρις οὐ γάμον, ἀλλὰ τιν' ἄταν Ἥγάγετ' εὐναίαν εἰς θαλάμους Ἑλέναν, or more probably 'a phantom-form that seemed not so, but as if it were the real Helen, was a cause of strife to the Greeks.'

1225.

φίλος γὰρ ἔστιν, ὅστις ἔστιν, ἐνθάδ' ὦν.

The emendations of this *v.* are bad, and the words in themselves look likely to be right. I think the sense may be as follows: 'Why, whoever he is (that brought the news), now that he is here, he is a friend; and treating him as such, I accept his intelligence as true, and have cut off my hair for my husband's death.' The reply of Theoclymenus takes up this doubt suggested by Helen: 'Are you sure that you are right in thus lamenting him?' To which she replies ironically: 'Of course you do not care for the death of *your* relations,' retaining *θανεῖν* of LG.

1247. I repeat here, as at least plausible, my conj. *ἐξορίζομεν*, a word which Eurip. affects. The Indices mention five passages. 'We take beyond the borders and let down into the sea the last offerings to the dead who have perished by wreck.'

1272.

Φοίνισσα κόπη ταχύπορος γενήσεται.

Paley and v. H. agree in thinking *γενήσεται* to be the auxiliary verb, the latter, however, adding 'si sanum.' The natural sense here, 'shall be forthcoming,' is denied by v. H. to be Greek: he mentions as emendations *σταλήσεται* (Schmidt), *δοθήσεται* (Naber).

Here again I should not feel certain that an occasional, though doubtless rare, usage had not been admitted by the poet. Something like it, at any rate, is H. F. 603 μένοντι δ' αὐτοῦ πάντα σοι γενήσεται | τῇ τ' ἀσφαλείᾳ κερδανεῖς.

1301-70. v. H. has done a most important service in recalling throughout this obscure chorus the readings of LG, only admitting such conjectures as

appear nearly certain. Thus in 1310, 1311 *θηρῶν ὅτε ζυγίους | ζεύξασα* (notice the iteration) *θεὰ σατίνας*, the conj. of Hermann, *ζευξάσα θεᾷ*, had displeased my sense of Euripidean manner as far back as 1882, and I rejoice to see the nominative reinstated. Again, 1354 *λύπαν ἐξαλλάξατ' ἀλαλᾷ* is printed (though with an obelus), not *ἀλᾶν*, which Badham shows to be inept. *ἀλαλᾷ* is supported by 1354 *τερφθεῖσ' ἀλαλαγμῶ*, but the metre seems to require a word like *ἀλλάξατ'* (Musgrave). Again, in 1355, 6 the MS reading, *ὦν οὐ θέμις οὐθ' ὁσία | ἐπύρωσας ἐν θαλάμοις*, whatever the allusion may be, is faithfully retained by v. H. In this perplexing distich, the genitive *ὦν* depends, I think, on the two nominatives *θέμις* and *ὁσία*: Lightfoot's view that *ἐπύρωσας* refers to kindling some kind of sacrifice *must* be right, for the word is used in all the eleven passages where it occurs in Eurip. of *literal*, not metaphorical, kindling. Possibly Paris and Helen offered in their chamber some nuptial rite against religious usage. According to the Schol. Ven. on Il. XIII 461, Rhea was incensed at Paris for some reason not stated: if the scholiast had been more explicit, we might have found the solution of our passage. In the conclamated finale, 1368–70, I make the following suggestion:

*εἶθε νιν ἄμασιν
ὑπέρβαλες, 'Ελένα.
μορφᾷ μόνον ἡύχεις.*

'Would that you had joined in the night-vigils of the Great Mother, Helen, had competed with the Goddess in throwing the sacred rods, and surpassed her in your skill: as it is, you did but vie with her in *beauty*.' By which is implied that Rhea was really jealous of Helen's beauty, and wreaked her anger on the plea of Helen's neglecting her cultus. Il. XXIII 891 *ἡδ' ὁσσον δυνάμει τε καὶ ἡμασιν ἐπλεν ἄριστος*.

1424. This note would be much improved by excision of half. v. H.'s own highly probable emendation having once been mentioned, the others, which are vastly inferior, are *de trop*.

1498–1500. *μόλοιτέ ποθ' ἵππιον οἶμα
δι' αἰθέρος ἰέμενοι
παῖδες Τυνδαρίδαι.*

οἶμα is in L, with *δ* superscribed by a later hand. The correction had been made by Hermann before L had been collated with the exactness of the present time. *ἄρμα*, which is the reading of most editions, is written in the margin of L, but is rightly condemned by v. H. as inept.

1515, 16. *'Αναξ †τα κάκιστ' ἐν δόμοις ἡνρήκαμεν,
ὥς καὶν' ἀκούσῃ πῆματ' ἐξ ἐμοῦ τάχα.*

I believe *τὰ κάκιστ'* is an error for *τάχιστα σ'*. The iteration of *τάχα* in the following v. is, as I have noticed above, a marked peculiarity of the Helena. The superlative has its full force: 'we have been as quick as we could in finding you; for you will be told without much delay a story of new misfortune.'

1538-40.

ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἰστόν, ὁ δὲ πλάτην καθίστατο
 ταρσόν τε χειρὶ, λευκά θ' ἰστί 'εἰς ἐν ἦν
 πηδάλιά τε ζεύγλαισι παρακαθίετο.

Badham (in 1851) wrote: 'In *εἰς ἐν ἦν* latet aliud uerbum in tempore imperfecto quod cruere nondum mihi contigit.' Will the missing imperfect *ever* see the light? Certainly neither *εἰσένει* (Jerram), nor *ἐνετίθει* (Paley), nor *εἵλκετο* (Rauchenstein), nor *εἰμέν' ἦν* (Böckh) satisfy. Each time I have returned to the passage, I have held exactly the same view, that *εἰς ἐν ἦν* is genuine, 'the sails fitted nicely into one figure,' 'fitted square.' I see that the edd. are agreed to write *καθίστατο*: LG give *καθίστατο*, which may be *καθείστατο*. In the Hippolytus 31 γῆς τῆσδε ναὸν Κύπριδος ἐγκαθείστατο.

1559. *κονφίζοντα*, sc. *πόδα*, to be got by anastrophe from *ταύρειος δὲ πούς*.

1594.

πάλιν πλέωμεν φναζίαν κέλευε σύ,
 σὺ δὲ στρέφ' οἶακ'.

This is the most desperate passage in the Helena. Possibly *ἄναξ* 'lurks' in *ναζίαν*, some monosyllable preceding, *εἶ'* or *ἀλλ'* or *ἦν* (*εν*). *ἄναξ* I should explain proleptically, 'come on, you be master and time the rowing, you turn round the rudder.' The explanation I once proposed, that *Ναζίαν* = *δολίαν*, a mythological allusion to the betrayal of Bacchus by a crew who, when he asked to be taken to Naxos, treacherously steered in the opposite and wrong direction (Ov. Met. III 641 sqq.), or to Bacchus' own treacherous betrayal of Ariadne at Naxos (Journal of Philol. XII 73), I do not wholly retract, but consider too remote to be very probable.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

Word-formation in the Roman Sermo Plebeius. An historical study of the development of vocabulary in vulgar and late Latin, with special reference to the Romance languages. New York, Ginn & Co., 1895. 8vo, pp. xlvii, 329. \$2.50.

This book contains a List of Authorities, an Introduction (pp. xv-xlvii) and chapters of considerable length upon Derivation and Composition. Under the first head such topics as Abstract Substantives in *-tio* and *-tus*, Concrete Substantives in *-o* (*-onis*) and *-tor*, Adjectives in *-bundus* and *-bilis*, Adverbs in *-im* and *-ter* are considered. Under the second head the main topics are Prepositional Compounds, Nominal Composition and Hybrids.

The List of Authorities contains 90 titles and is of great value, although some additions may be made to it. Thus, no mention is made, on the one hand, of the monographs of Schmalz, Becher and Hellmuth upon the language of Cicero's correspondents, of the admirable lexical paper by Cesareo (De Petronii Sermone, I. A. Cesareo, Romae, 1887), nor, on the other hand, of certain more elaborate collections and treatises like the Corpus Glossarium of Loewe and Goetz. Now and then a title which is omitted in the List of Authorities may be found in a footnote. This is true in the case of Landgraf's articles in the Blätt. f. d. bayer. Gymn. XVI (see footnote, p. 92, where, however, one should read XVI, not VII), and in the case of Etienne's De Deminutivis, etc. (cf. footnote, p. 141).